

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the phone interview on August 12, 2003. In the interview, claims 1, 9 and 57 were discussed. The Examiner maintained his rejections with regards to claims 9 and 57 and withdrew his rejection with regards to claim 1. The rejection was withdrawn because the adhesive 306 of *Hart* does not electrically ... couple the elements of the first and second members together so as to form a singular composite structure that ... shields the computing device. With regards to claim 9, the Examiner asserted that the adhesive 306 of *Hart* inherently absorbs geometric variations as required by the claim. With regards to claim 57, the Examiner asserted that a joint configured to electrically bond the first and second conductive portions together as required by claim 57 is taught in Col. 3, lines 65-68 of *Terakawa* (rather than Col. 5, lines 65-68 as indicated in the outstanding office action).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-35 and 57-62 under 35 USC 102. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 9, 31 and 57 have been amended. Claims 63-72 have been added. Claims 32-56 and 59-62 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 18-31, 57, 58 and 63-72 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 18-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hart* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,164,542).

Claim 1

In the interview, the Examiner agreed with the undersigned that the rejection to claim 1 (and therefore its dependents) should be withdrawn. As discussed, *Hart* does not teach or suggest, "...electrically...coupling the elements of the first and second members together so as to

form a singular composite structure that...shields the computing device from electronic emissions,” as required by claim 1 (and its dependents).

Claim 20

The rejection to this claim should be withdrawn for the same reasons as given above with regards to claim 1. While *Hart* may disclose adhesive 306, *Hart* does not teach or suggest, “...a conductive bridge **electrically bonding** the first and second surfaces and electrically sealing an interface between the first and second conductive surfaces so as to form a **singular conductive structure** for shielding electronic emissions,” as required by claim 20 (and its dependents). In *Hart*, the adhesive 306 attaches the connector plate 122 to the outer housing member 118. The adhesive 306 does not form an electrical bond or electrically seal the interface between the connector plate 122 and the outer housing member 118. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claim 9

Also in contrast to *Hart*, claim 9 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...a glue disposed between the casing and the frame...” and further “...the glue structurally attaching the casing and the frame to form a singular composite structure...” *Hart* does not teach or suggest glue, but rather a layer of adhesive 306. While glue may generally be called an adhesive, *Hart* provides no evidence that the layer of adhesive 306 is a glue. In fact, the only adhesive that is mentioned by *Hart* are adhesive strips used to secure brackets 152 and 154 to the outer member 118 (see Col. 6 lines 40-42). Adhesive strips, however, are not glue, but rather strips coated with an adhesive (e.g., tape).

Moreover, *Hart* does not teach or suggest “the glue being arranged to absorb geometric variations found in the frame or casing so as to meet a predetermined geometry of the component, the casing and the frame being arranged to provide an adjustable gap therebetween for the placement of the glue, the dimensions of the glue conforming to the adjustable gap to reduce tolerance variability in the glued component” as required by claim 9. One advantage of glue over other adhesives such as strips is that its dimensions are adjustable (e.g., applied in a liquid state). Because the glue can adjust its dimensions, the glue can conform to its surroundings before hardening thus allowing for adjustability in the final dimension of the parts

being glued. In contrast, the dimensions of strips such as in *Hart* are typically fixed or non adjustable, i.e., they have a predetermined height, thickness and length. Based on the fact that *Hart* teaches strips and provides no evidence for compensating for tolerances, one skilled in the art would simply not go in the direction of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claim 31

In contrast to *Hart*, claim 31 specifically requires, "...the interface between the first member and the second member being electrically sealed via a conductive paste so as to shield the interface from electronic emissions..." and "...the interface between the third member and the fourth member being electrically sealed via a second conductive paste so as to shield the interface from electronic emissions..." While *Hart* may disclose a layer of adhesive 306, *Hart* does not teach or suggest a conductive paste for electrically sealing an interface from electronic emissions. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 3-8, 12-16, 18, 19 and 21-30 (claims 32-35 were cancelled) should be withdrawn for at least the reasons as above, it should be noted that they offer additional language that is unsupported by the art. For example, none of the references teach or suggest, "...wherein the means has a liquid state for flowing between the first and second members and a solid state for permanently attaching itself to the first and second members." as required by claim 4, and "...wherein the means includes a structural glue and a conductive paste" as required by claim 5. The references additionally do not teach or suggest, "wherein the glue is a two part epoxy" as required by claim 13, "...wherein the conductive bridge is a conductive paste..." as required by claim 21, "...wherein the conductive paste is a metal filled electrically conductive ink..." as required by claims 23, "...wherein the plastic material is a carbon fiber plastic, the second metallic material is a nickel plated layer, and the metallic material is titanium sheet metal..." as required by 27, and "wherein the conductive bridge is formed from a nickel filled electrically conductive ink" as required by claim 28.

Claims 57-62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Terakawa* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,008,486).


In contrast to *Terakawa*, claim 57 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a joint configured to...structurally attach the first and second structural members together in order to form a single composite structure for housing at least a portion of the computing device." First, *Terakawa* does not disclose a computing device. *Terakawa* is directed at electromagnetic wave shielding panels and wall structure which are suitable for use in forming electromagnetic wave shielding rooms. Shielding rooms are simply not computing devices, i.e., rooms and devices are not the same thing. Second, *Terakawa* does not teach or suggest a single composite structure. While *Terakawa* may disclose shielding panels with adjacent surfaces abutted against each other, *Terakawa* does not teach or suggest forming a single composite structure with the shielding panels. In Fig. 2 of *Terakawa*, the panels 1 are abutted against one another thus they do not form a singular composite structure. In Figs. 3, 4 and 7 of *Terakawa*, the plate members 20 and 30 are connected using a wedge 10 thus they do not form a singular composite structure. *Terakawa* states, "The size and shape of the wedge member 10 are determined so as to cause generation of sufficient holding force upon insertion of the wedge member in the opposite slots of the adjacent panels 20 (Col. 5, lines 46-50)." In Figs. 5 and 6 of *Terakawa*, the plate members 20/21 and 30/31 are connected via a slot 11 and a ridge 13 thus they do not form a singular composite structure. *Terakawa* states, "These male and female structures take the place of the wedging member 10, which otherwise, would be used in integrally connecting the adjacent panels (Col. 6, lines 10-14)." Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Quin C. Hoellwarth", written in a cursive style.

Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300